# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/955,361 | 09/18/2001 | Fuad Rashid | M-11649 US | 9514 |

60975          7590          11/24/2006

CSA LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| STORK, KYLE R |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2178 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 09/955,361 | RASHID ET AL. |
| **Office Action Summary** | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kyle R. Stork | 2178 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-20,22-39,41-58 and 60-77* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-20,22-39,41-58 and 60-77* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This non-final office action is in response to the remarks filed 11 August 2006.

2.      Claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, and 60-77 are pending.  Claims 1, 20, 39, 58, and 77 are

independent.  The rejection of claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, and 60-77 under 35 USC 103 under:

Mack et al. (US 2002/0054115, filed 11 June 2001, hereafter Mack) and further in view

of Adobe® GoLive™ 5.0 User Guide (Adobe, 2000, hereafter Adobe),

Mack and Adobe, and further in view of Hall (Core Servlets and JavaServer Pages™,

Prentice Hall, 2000),

Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Ladd (Using HTML 4, XML, and Java 1.2, 1999, Que, Platinum

Edition, Page 1004, hereinafter Ladd),

Mack, Adobe, Hall and further in view of Watters (USPN 5,897,645—filing date

11/22/1996),

Mack, Adobe, Hall, Watters, and further in view of Ladd,

Mack, Adobe, Hall, and further in view of Kwong et al. (USPN 6,289,506 B1—filing

date 6/30/1998),

Mack, Adobe, Hall, Kwong, and further in view of Ladd,

Mack, Adobe, Hall, and further in view of Orbanes et al. (USPAP 2002/0075311 A1—

filing date 2/14/2001),

Mack, Adobe, Hall, Orbanes, and further in view of Ladd,

Mack and Adobe, and further in view of "XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0" (16

November 1999, w3c.org, hereafter XSL)

has been withdrawn.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.      Claims 1, 11, 14, 20, 30, 33, 39, 49, 52, 58, 68, and 72 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack et al. (US 2002/0054115, filed 11 June 2001,

hereafter Mack) and further in view of Adobe® GoLive™ 5.0 User Guide (Adobe, 2000,

hereafter Adobe), and further in view of Hall (Core Servlets and JavaServer Pages™, Prentice

Hall, 2000).

As per independent claim 1, Mack discloses a method comprising:

- Migrating a Cartesian coordinate-based view to the tag field-based view, wherein the

  migration comprises:

    o  Identifying a first applet of the one or more applets wherein the first applet

       comprises one or more controls (paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, a Java

       applet is identified to be converted to XML)

    o  Associating a first applet template with the first applet, wherein the first applet

       template comprises one or more characteristics of each of the one or more

       controls (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, twin servlets acts as templates,

       converting Java applets to XML, and conversely, converting XML back to Java

       applets)

  o   Linking the first applet template to a corresponding first Cartesian view applet in
      the Cartesian coordinate-based view, wherein the first Cartesian view applet
      comprises a Cartesian view control (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, the
      operating buttons are in a Cartesian view (standard x-y coordinate space))

  o   Mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag field-based view
      (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024)

Mack fails to specifically disclose modifying the Cartesian view control to produce a

corresponding tag view control, wherein said modifying matches characteristics of an associated

control of the one or more controls in the first template. However, Adobe discloses adding

control buttons to tag-based view (pages 306-307). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack's method

of converting applets to tag-based views with Adobe's method of adding control buttons to a tag-

based view, since it would have allowed a user to interact with the tag-based data (Adobe: page

306).

Mack fails to disclose selecting a tag field-based view comprising one or more applets.

However, Adobe discloses selection of a tag-based view for displaying HTML (page 62: Here,

the HTML Source Editor tab allows a user to view and edit the HTML of a document, with

HTML being a tab-based language). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack and Adobe, since it would

have allowed a user to directly edit HTML source code (Adobe: page 62).

Hall discloses HTML containing one or more applets (pages 274-283: Here, applets are

embedded within an HTML document, which is a tag field-based language). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hall with Mack, since it would have allowed a user easily embed applet code within a tag based-field document (Hall: page 275).

As per dependent claim 11, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose adding controls to suit a user's needs. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be added to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add controls to a template to expand the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.

As per dependent claim 14, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose deleting controls to suit a user's needs. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that controls may be deleted from a template to remove excess capabilities from a template to suit a user's needs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to remove controls from a template to tailor the capabilities of the template to suit a user's needs.

As per independent claims 20, 39, 58, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 20, 39, and 58 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 30, 49, 68, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 11. Claims 30, 49, and 68 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 33, 52, 71, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially

similar to those in claim 14. Claims 33, 52, and 71 are similarly rejected.


5.      Claims 3-4, 12-13, 15-16, 22-23, 31-32, 34-35, 41-42, 50-51, 53-54, 60-61, 69-70, and

72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, and Hall,

and further in view of Ladd (Using HTML 4, XML, and Java 1.2, 1999, Que, Platinum Edition,

Page 1004, hereinafter Ladd).

As per dependent claim 3, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those

in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose a

field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with at least one field control. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have at

least one field control because fields accept user input from the keyboard.

As per dependent claim 4, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those

in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose a

non-field control. However, page 1004 of Ladd depicts an applet with at least one non-field

control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to have at least one non-field control because non-field controls constrain user input.

As per dependent claims 12, 15, 22, 31, 34, 41, 50, 53, 60, 69, and 72 the applicant

discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claims 12, 15, 22, 31, 34, 41, 50, 53, 60, 69,

and 72 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 13, 16, 23, 32, 35, 42, 51, 54, 61, 70, and 73 the applicant

discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claims 13, 16, 23, 32, 35, 42, 51, 54, 61, 70,

and 73 are similarly rejected.

6.      Claims 5, 24, 43, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and further in view of Watters (USPN 5,897,645—filing date

11/22/1996).

As per dependent claim 5, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those

in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose

mapping the controls to specific sequence numbers. However, Watters discloses in col. 11, lines

25-45 mapping controls to a sequence number in order to allow successful processing of control

record data.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use mapping of controls to sequence numbers in order to allow successful

processing of control record data.

As per dependent claims 24, 43, and 62, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to

those in claim 5. Claims 24, 43, and 62 are similarly rejected.

7.      Claims 6-7, 25-26, 44-45, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and Watters, and further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 6, 25, 44, and 63, the applicant discloses the limitations similar

to those in claim 3. Claims 6, 25, 44, and 63 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 7, 26, 45, and 64, the applicant discloses the limitations similar

to those in claim 4. Claims 7, 26, 45, and 64 are similarly rejected.

8.      Claims 8, 27, 46, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and further in view of Kwong et al. (USPN 6,289,506 B1—filing date

6/30/1998).

As per dependent claim 8, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to those

in claim 1. Mack fails to specifically disclose mapping the controls to specific sequence

numbers. However, Kwong discloses in col. 4, lines 5-25 mapping the applet to a specific

sequence number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to use mapping of applets to sequence numbers in order to control execution order

of Java directives to optimize performance.

As per dependent claim 27, 46, and 65, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to

those in claim 8. Claims 27, 46, and 65 are similarly rejected.

9.      Claims 9-10, 28-29, 47-48, and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Kwong, further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 9, 28, 47, and 66, the applicant discloses the limitations similar

to those in claim 3. Claims 9, 28, 47, and 66 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 10, 29, 48, and 67, the applicant discloses the limitations similar

to those in claim 4. Claims 10, 29, 48, and 67 are similarly rejected.

10.    Claim 17, 36, 55, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mack, Adobe, and Hall, and further in view of Orbanes et al. (USPAP 2002/0075311 A1—filing

date 2/14/2001).

As per dependent claim 17, Mack, Adobe, and Hall disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.  Mack fails to specifically

disclose providing one or more model view for a user to select from, wherein one or more

selected model views correspond to the Cartesian coordinate-based view.  However, Orbanes

discloses providing a Cartesian coordinate-based model view in order to provide a virtual

perspective on the system.  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to provide model views in order to provide a virtual perspective on the

system.

As per dependent claims 36, 55, and 74, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to

those in claim 17.  Claims 36, 55, and 74 are similarly rejected.

11.    Claims 18-19, 37-38, 56-57 and 75-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mack, Adobe, Hall, and Obrnaes, and further in view of Ladd.

As per dependent claims 18, 37, 56, and 75, the applicant discloses the limitations similar

to those in claim 3.  Claims 18, 37, 56, and 75 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 19, 38, 57, and 76, the applicant discloses the limitations similar

to those in claim 4.  Claims 19, 38, 57, and 76 are similarly rejected.

12.     Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack and Adobe

and further in view of "XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0" (16 November 1999,

w3c.org, hereafter XSL).

As per dependent claim 77, Mack and Adobe disclose the limitations similar to those in

claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose

associating a tag field-based view template with the tag field-based view and mapping the

corresponding tag view control to the tag-field-based template. However, XSL discloses

associating a tag field-based view template with the tag field-based view and mapping the

corresponding tag view control to the tag-field-based template (sections 1 and 5.4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Mack and Adobe with XSL, since it would have allowed a user to

process and format tag-based data (XSL: section 1).


### Response to Arguments

13.     Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

**CESAR PAULA**
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**